

## **REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated February 20, 2009, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on May 20, 2009. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 9-13 and 25-31 are pending in the application. Claims 9-13 and 25-41 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 9 and 25 have been amended. New claims 32-41 have been added to recite aspects of the invention. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter.

Further, Applicants are not conceding in this application that those amended claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these pre-amended claims and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With this response, Applicants have amended claims 9 and 25 to recite “applied, by operation of one or more computer processors . . . .” Applicants submit that the claims, as amended, are directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is obviated.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9-13 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Barger et al.*, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0252888 (hereinafter

*Barger*) further in view of *Glass et al.*, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0261016 (hereinafter *Glass*).

With this response, Applicants have amended claims 9 and 25 to recite “applied, by operation of one or more computer processors . . . .” Applicants submit that the claims, as amended, are not taught by the references, alone or in combination. For example, even assuming, *arguendo*, that *Glass* describes an “annotation policy”, the annotation policy is merely used by a *human individual* to assist the human individual in applying *human reasoning*. See, e.g., *Glass*, ¶ 176 (“A trained document annotator may judge the contents of a document and semantically label its contents by applying human reasoning and, as needed, by referring to a document annotation policy, thereby saving time and effort.” (emphasis added)). Therefore, the references do not teach or suggest the recited annotation policy. On this basis alone, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is obviated.

Further, the relationship identified by the Examiner between the *document annotation policy* in *Glass* and in the present claims is nothing more than a coincidence of terms. In fact, the references, even when combined, fail to teach or suggest the recited document annotation policy. For example, the Examiner concedes that *Barger* fails to disclose the recited document annotation policy. See Office Action, page 6 (“Barger does not explicitly disclose “selecting one or more annotation versioning policies . . . .”). Further, the Examiner suggests that *Glass* teaches the following underlined limitations of claim 9 (claim 25 recites similar limitations): “selecting one or more annotation versioning policies dictating how annotations made for a current version of a document are applied to a subsequent version of the document.” That is, the Examiner is not suggesting that *Glass* discloses *any* aspect of the recited annotation versioning policies *other than* the mere coincidence of terms (i.e., “annotation versioning policies”). In fact (as demonstrated above), the document annotation policy in *Glass* bears no resemblance at all to the recited annotation policy. Thus, the references do not teach or suggest the recited annotation policy. On this basis also, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is obviated.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and  
**S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,**

/Gero G. MCCLELLAN, Reg. #44227/

---

Gero G. McClellan  
Registration No. 44,227  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicant(s)